



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/068,866	10/23/1998	KATSUAKIRA MORIWAKE	450108-4484	2773
------------	------------	---------------------	-------------	------

20999 7590 08/14/2002

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

JOSEPH, THOMAS J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/068,866

Applicant(s)

MORIWAKE ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas J Joseph

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 143-161 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 143-161 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 17.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 143 – 161 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klingler et al. (pat. # 5,404,316), Langford et al. (pat. # 5,206,929), and Carlucci et al. (US 5,191,645)

Claims 143 and 153 are rejected. Klingler demonstrates a method for processing clip data (fig. 5). This processing falls within the definition of editing. The claim language fails to provide an explanation of the type of clip editing intended by the applicant. Klingler teaches a user selecting editing, composing, or applying effects to clips (col. 16, lines 57 - 70). The special effects library describe herein teaches a method for applying effects to clips. The language of the claims fails to explain or define the type of editing, composing, or applying a special effect to plurality of clips. Klingler at least suggest or teach, "selectively performing at least one of editing, composing, or applying a special effect to said plurality of clips" as cited by the Applicant. Klingler teaches begin time clips and end time data (fig. 9, #152, #154). Klingler at least suggest or teach a "managing means for managing information pertaining to relations between the resultant clip and the plurality of clips, said information at lest indicating from which of said plurality of clips said resultant clip is

produced” as cited by the Applicant. Klingler teaches a window for managing and processing clip data (fig. 9). This window is a, “control means for controlling said plurality of modules based on said information managed by said managing means” as cited by the Applicant. Klingler teaches a resultant clip because doing so directs the user to the clip wherein the result can be viewed and displayed (fig. 11). This preview window is a method wherein a result can be viewed and displayed. Klingler demonstrates a means for displaying a table indicating resultant clips and said information pertaining to relations between each resultant clip and the plurality of clips (fig. 17). The displayed frames are a plurality of clips. Klingler teaches a table that includes rows and columns wherein each row includes information for a respective resultant clip (fig. 17). Klingler teaches a second column of the said row indicating the said plurality of clips and resultant clips that are produced (fig. 17).

Klingler fails to teach the use of modules. Langford teaches a plurality of modules that performs information managing by said managing means (fig. 8; col. 6, lines 55 – 70). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the clip editing system taught by Klingler with the editing system using modules disclosed by Langford. Doing so allows for assigning software operations to specific modular apparatuses.

Langford fails to teach a first column of said row that includes an identification code for resultant clips. Carlucci teaches a first column of said row that includes an identification code for resultant clips (fig. 10). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the table for displaying

identification codes taught by Carlucci with clip editing system using modules disclosed by Klinger and Langford. Doing so allows for gives the user to assign a type of numeric code for each frame.

Claims 144 and 154 are rejected. Klinger provides a directory access for accessing data related to the various clips, effects, etc. (fig. 15, #214, #216). Such buttons suggest the presence of a database for accessing event and clip data. Klinger at least teaches or suggests, "a managing means that includes a database for registering information for each of said plurality of clips" as cited by the Applicant.

Claims 145 and 155 are rejected. Klinger teaches obtaining data from a source for viewing by a user (fig. 15, #211, #213). This is information indicating a second clip being produced from a first clip. Any type of copying of data is information indicating a second clip being produced from a first clip. The claim language does not require that the said second clip be a subset of the first clip. The only requirement is that the second clip includes some data that is based on the data found in the first clip.

Claims 146 and 156 are rejected. Klinger teaches special effect operations and other editing functions (col. 16, lines 57 - 70). Such operations suggest a plurality of modules comprising, "an edit module for editing said plurality of clips, a composite module for composing said clips, and a special effect module for applying a special effect to said clips" as cited by the Applicant.

Claim 147 is rejected. The technology taught or suggested in Klinger (fig. 15) by claim 146 represents the "display means for displaying a graphical user interface respectively representing said editing module, composite module, and said special

effect module on a display” as cited by the applicant. The Applicant fails to define the type of graphics or the type of display used in the displaying of these modules. The claim language provides no explanation regarding the display of the said modules and no indication whether the modules themselves are even to be displayed.

Claims 148 and 157 are rejected. Klinger teaches a preview area wherein the user can view resultant graphical data (fig. 15, #213, #154). Such a preview area is a method for providing “module identification information indicating which of said plurality of processing modules is used to produce said resultant clip” as cited by the Applicant.

Claims 149 and 158 are rejected. Klinger teaches a control means controlling said plurality of modules based on said information registered in said database (fig. 15, #214, #216). Any menu is a control means for controlling the information registered in the database. The claim language fails to define or explain the type of control intended by the Applicant.

Claims 150 and 159 are rejected. The preview area taught by claim 148 and suggested by Klinger suggest or teach a control means that updates the “content of a first resultant clip registered in the database, and updates content of resultant clips produced from the said resultant clip” as cited by the Applicant.

Claims 151 and 160 are rejected. Klinger demonstrates moving of effect data into a “movie” or other entity representing a clip (col. 10, lines 30 – 40). This operation essentially overwrites content of a first resultant clip registered in the database with content of a new resultant clip, and updates the content of resultant clips produced from said first resultant clip.

Claims 152 and 161 are rejected. Klingler teaches a control means storing said overwritten content of said first resultant clips produced from said first resultant clip (col. 10, lines 30 – 40). All data must be stored in the database.

Response to Amendment

3. The Applicant amended independent claims 143 and 153 then requested reconsideration for the dependent claims.


The remaining Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 143 - 162 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J Joseph whose telephone number is 703-305-3917. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

tjj 
August 7, 2002


KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100